

REMARKS

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 45-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Botzko et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,597). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Botzko et al. provide a method of distributing audio signals in an audio conference. The method involves feeding compressed audio signals from each one of a plurality of audio sources to an audio processor, and selectively coupling the compressed audio signals from one of the plurality of audio sources to an output based on uncompressed audio signals from the plurality of audio sources (col. 2, ll. 14-28; Figures 2-3).

Claims 45, 60, 64, 73 and 80 have been amended such that each of the independent claims now require that each of a plurality of audio ports is assigned to one of a plurality of endpoints and each audio port processes input audio signals from its assigned endpoint and output audio that is to be sent to its assigned endpoint. The Botzko does not teach or suggest this limitation. In contrast, Botzko teaches each one of the audio processor assigned to a given distributes audio signals received from the other endpoints, rather than the signals from its own endpoint. *See*, col. 4, ll. 25-33. For example, processor 14c in Figure 2 is assigned to site C. This processor receives, processes, and distributes audio signals from sites A, B, and D, but does not process input audio from site C, as would be required by the amended claims. Botzko does not teach or suggest processor 14c would receive any signals from its assigned site C. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Botzko actually teaches away from the present invention in that Botzko only teaches an audio processor that receives input from a plurality of audio sources but not from its assigned endpoint (*see* Figures 2-3).

Because Botzko does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the present claims, Applicant submits that Botzko does not anticipate independent claims 45, 60, 64, 68, 73 and 80. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 45-81 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Botzko et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,597) in view of well-known art. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 53 is dependent from claim 45. As discussed above, Botzko does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of claim 45. Specifically, Botzko does not teach or suggest the limitation of "each audio port processes input audio signals from its assigned endpoint." Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because "to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03. In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Sept. 19, 2005
Date:

Wong Cabello, LLP
20333 SH 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
(832) 446-2422


Raymond Reese
Reg. No. 47,891